

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application as amended. Claims 21-40 remain in the application. Claims 21, 24-27 and 29-40 have been amended. Claims 1-20 have been cancelled, without prejudice.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 1, 4-6 and 9-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,282,206 of Hindus et al. ("Hindus").

Applicants do not admit that Hindus teaches each and every element as recited in claims 1, 4-6 and 9-10. Nonetheless, Applicants respectfully cancel claims 1, 4-6, and 9-10 without prejudice.

Claims 11, 13, 16 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,529,183 of MacLean et al. ("MacLean").

Applicants do not admit that MacLean teaches each and every element as recited in claims 11, 13, 16, and 19. Nonetheless, Applicants respectfully cancel claims 11, 13, 16, and 19 without prejudice.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 2 and 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,282,206 of Hindus et al. ("Hindus") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,337,678 of Fish ("Fish"). Applicants do not admit that this combination teaches each and every element as

recited in claims 2 and 7. Nonetheless, Applicants respectfully cancel claims 2 and 7 without prejudice.

Claims 3 and 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,282,206 of Hindus et al. (“Hindus”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,525,711 of Shaw et al. (“Shaw”). Applicants do not admit that this combination teaches each and every element as recited in claims 3 and 8. Nonetheless, Applicants respectfully cancel claims 3 and 8 without prejudice.

Claims 12 and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,529,183 of MacLean et al. (“MacLean”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,337,678 of Fish (“Fish”). Applicants do not admit that this combination teaches each and every element as recited in claims 12 and 17. Nonetheless, Applicants respectfully cancel claims 12 and 17 without prejudice.

Claims 15 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,529,183 of MacLean et al. (“MacLean”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,525,711 of Shaw et al. (“Shaw”). Applicants do not admit that this combination teaches each and every element as recited in claims 15 and 18. Nonetheless, Applicants respectfully cancel claims 15 and 18 without prejudice.

Claims 14 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,529,183 of MacLean et al. (“MacLean”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,282,206 of Hindus et al. (“Hindus”). Applicants do not admit that this combination teaches each and every element as recited in claims 14 and 20. Nonetheless, Applicants respectfully cancel claims 14 and 20 without prejudice.

Claims 21, 24-26, 29-31, 34-36 and 39-40 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,282,206 of Hindus et al. (“Hindus”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,529,183 of MacLean et al. (“MacLean”).

The office action states:

As to claim 21, Hindus teaches an apparatus includes a first haptel (joystick device at the first communication) wherein a signal is generated in response to subjecting the haptel to a stimulus, a transmitter to transmit the signal (the transmitter is what transmit the data from one communication station to another) and a receive to receive the signal (the receiver is what receive the data from one communication station to another), and a second haptel to reproduce the stimulus responsive to the signal (col. 11, lines 6-18).

Hindus does not teach having the quantity rendered on the haptel.

However, MacLean teaches a haptel (302) wherein the haptel is responsive to a signal (col. 6, lines 10-27). MacLean teaches having a quantity rendered on the haptel (col. 19, lines 42-51).

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the assertion that Hindus teaches, at least, the limitation of “a second haptel to reproduce the stimulus responsive to the signal,” as recited in claim 21. The stimulus reproduced on the second haptel is the same stimulus produced on the first haptel. Neither Hindus nor MacLean disclose a stimulus on a first haptel will be reproduced on a second haptel. Specifically, in the section cited in the Office Action, Hindus discloses that a high bandwidth input type can be converted to a low bandwidth output signal which provides haptic feedback to a receiver at a second communication station. Therefore, this sentence does not disclose that the device creating the high bandwidth input type signal includes a haptel. Furthermore, the sentence clearly indicates that the high bandwidth input type is converted to a low bandwidth type, hence, it will not “reproduce *the* stimulus,” as claimed. The section cited in the Office Action goes on to disclose that the high bandwidth audio at a first communication state can be converted to a rumbling feeling at a force feedback joystick at a second communication station. Again, this is not the same as reproducing the stimulus at a second haptel, as claimed. Recall, that the motivation of Hindus is to automatically modify the bandwidth of a communication between parties based on the devices and network being used to

send and receive the transmission. (See column 5, line 5 – column 6, line 29). For example, Hindus discloses, on preferred approach, of “keeping the frame rate at a standard transmission rates but cut the resolution dramatically, e.g., by “cartoonizing” or “tooning” by several orders of magnitude (before compression) and in abstraction by replacing a full frame with a few integers.” (Column 5, lines 31-43). However, Hindus discloses the conversion of a high bandwidth activity to a low bandwidth activity, and not reproducing a stimulus subjected to a first haptel onto a second haptel, as claimed.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Hindus in view of MacLean does not teach each and every limitation as recited in claim 21. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully request the rejection to claim 21 be withdrawn. Independent claims 26, 31, and 36 contain limitations or limitations similar to reproducing a stimulus subjected to a first haptel onto a second haptel. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Hindus in view of MacLean does not teach each and every limitation and respectfully request the rejections to claims 26, 31, and 36 be withdrawn. Claims 24-25, 27, 29-30, 34, and 39-40 are dependent (directly or indirectly) on one of the claims 21, 26, 31, and 36. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the rejection to claims 24-25, 27, 29-30, 34, and 39-40 be withdrawn, at least for the reasons stated above.

Claims 22, 27, 32 and 37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,282,206 of Hindus et al. (“Hindus”) and U.S. Patent No. 6,529,183 of MacLean et al. (“MacLean”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,337,678 of Fish (“Fish”).

As articulated above, claims 21, 26, 31, and 36 are patentable over Hindus in view of MacLean. Claims 22, 27, 32 and 37 are dependent on one of claims 21, 26, 31, and 36. Fish fails to cure the underlying deficiencies of the combination, including the failure to teach reproducing a stimulus subjected to a first haptel onto a second haptel. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the rejections to claims 22, 27, 32 and 37 be withdrawn, at least for the reasons stated above.

Claims 23, 28, 33 and 38 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,282,206 of Hindus et al. ("Hindus") and U.S. Patent No. 6,529,183 of MacLean et al. ("MacLean") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,525,711 of Shaw et al. ("Shaw").

As articulated above, claims 21, 26, 31, and 36 are patentable over Hindus in view of MacLean. Claims 23, 28, 33 and 38 are dependent on one of claims 21, 26, 31, and 36. Fish fails to cure the underlying deficiencies of the combination, including the failure to teach reproducing a stimulus subjected to a first haptel onto a second haptel. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the rejections to claims 23, 28, 33 and 38 be withdrawn, at least for the reasons stated above.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections have been overcome by the amendments and remarks, and that the claims, as amended, are now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the rejections be withdrawn and the claims as amended be allowed.

If there are any additional charges, please charge Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any fee deficiency that may be due.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: November 24, 2003



André Gibbs
Reg. No. 47,593

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025-1026
(408) 720-8300